

CONTENTS

President's Message	1
Official Divisional Business	
Call for Nominations	3
Minutes of Division 14 Business Meeting	4
Minutes of Outgoing Executive Committee Meeting	7
Minutes of Incoming Executive Committee Meeting	10
New Fellows, Members and Associates of Division 14	12
Call for Nominations as a Division 14 Fellow	13
Announcements of Interest	
The 1966 Cattell Award Winner	14
New Awards	
The McKinsey Foundation for Management Research	16
Cattell Postdoctoral Fellowships	17
Other Announcements	18
News from Academia	
The Management Research Center of the University of Pittsburgh	24
The Graduate Program at Colorado State University	25
The Care and Feeding of Graduate Students	27
Professional Notes	
Questionable Ethics or Poor Judgment	31
Commission on Composition of Council	34
Report on Traineeship in Industrial Psychology	39
The Psychologist in Industry	40
Advisory Panel Appraises Suitability of USES Testing	41
Editorial Note	45
Division 14 Committee Structures 1966-67	Inside Back Cover
Newsletter Staff 1966-67	Back Cover
Nominating Ballot	Center Spread

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Psychology is often defined as the scientific study of human and animal behavior. As such, psychology is one of the youngest sciences; even so, an impressive body of knowledge about human behavior has been developed in the short span of less than a century since Wundt founded his Leipzig laboratory. Today, all psychologists are not scientists; many are professionals--purveyors of the knowledge developed by the scientific study of human behavior. This is as it should be, for a science that dares not leave the laboratory is in danger of stagnating from inattention to socially relevant issues and variables. In fact, many of psychology's more impressive contributions--intelligence testing, theories of learning, concepts of social process, communication and influence--grew out of individual psychologists' desires to advance the cause of human welfare through furthering the scientific understanding of behavior.

Unfortunately, it seems that much of contemporary psychology is lodged on sort of a plateau. In recent years, advances in understanding behavior seem to have been much fewer and less significant. There may be many reasons for this, but two stand out. First, most professionals are so busy putting knowledge to practical use that they have no time left to develop new knowledge or even to worry very much about socially relevant problems where knowledge gaps exist. Second, even many of the scientists seem caught up by the games of theory building, methodological and instrumental pet tending and null hypothesis testing (Dunnette, 1966). This trend apparently is unusually prevalent in experimental social psychology. Ring (1966) has recently charged that the only consistent trend in social psychological research is one of amusement--an excessive tendency toward designing flamboyant, contrived, and mirth producing studies at the expense of attacking socially relevant questions in a systematic manner.

Industrial psychology has nothing to crow about. First, many industrial psychologists are technique-bound; they are content to base their standards of conduct on the shifting and uninformed criteria established by industrial sponsors rather than on the basis of their own professional or scientific code. Haire recognized this trend as early as 1960 when he said:

"The adjective modifying psychology (industrial) once seemed to mean that there are some problems in industry

to which certain techniques developed in psychology offered useful practical solutions. As long as this was the view, the field remained a technical and ancillary one, with the successes of industrial psychology measured on the critical scales of industry rather than those of psychology (Haire, 1960; p. 272)."

Second, industrial psychologists seem to have given up studying behavior directly or experimentally; instead they seek to predict the indirect and often contaminated effects (criteria) of behavior by fixing their gaze on such global measures as profits, promotion rates, or satisfaction, and restricting their mode of investigation to correlational procedures. I contend that better understanding of human behavior in industry will not be achieved until we begin to observe and record behavior itself instead of behavior's consequences and until we seek to discover causal relationships by supplementing our correlational methods with experimental investigations.

Happily, we industrial psychologists are in a good position to lead the way for the rest of psychology. Our applied orientation and our focus on problems of human behavior in industry offers high probability that we will attack socially relevant questions. Moreover, since we operate in a rather "public" setting, we should find it less easy to sustain for long any illusions about pet theories, methods or the "importance" of our results. The road, it seems, is broad and clear for industrial psychology to make significant contributions to both the professional and scientific study of human behavior. If we do our jobs well, perhaps the rest of psychology will take note and move with us off the plateau on which we seem to be lodged.

Marvin D. Dunnette

Reference

Dunnette, M. D. Fads, fashions, and folderol in psychology. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 343-352.

Haire, M. Business is too important to be studied only by economists. American Psychologist, 1960, 15, 271-272.

Ring, K. Experimental social psychology: Some sober questions about some frivolous values. Mimeo. paper, Psychology Department, The University of Connecticut, 1966.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR DIVISION 14 OFFICES

The Division 14 By-laws provide an Elections Committee consisting of the immediate Past Presidents and the President Elect (Chairman). The Committee makes a mail call for nominees each year usually from the office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

Now that the Division has a Newsletter, the Committee has decided to put the Ballot in TIP. The ballot is in the Center Spread which can easily be removed. TIP was sent to you in an envelope instead of the usual wrapper so that we could include an envelope addressed to President Elect Ash in which you can send your nominations.

We are also publishing lists of past officers and members of the Council. Current Committee Chairmen are listed on the back cover of TIP. These lists and the Divisional membership list in the APA Directory should be an adequate source of names for you to consider.

OFFICIAL DIVISIONAL BUSINESS

Minutes of Division 14 Business Meeting

September 4, 1966

New York, New York

1. Secretary-Treasurer Report. Copies of the Annual Report and the Financial Statement were distributed to the membership.
 - a. Phil Ash reported that the balance on hand in the Division account was \$2,123.10. He pointed out that the annual Division budget is about \$4,000, and that the Division usually tried to retain a balance equal to one year's expenditures. At the current rate of expenditures, the Division is using up its reserves. It was moved, seconded, and approved by voice vote to increase the assessment on Members and Fellows to \$4.00 from \$2.00, as recommended by the Executive Committee.
 - b. The membership approved by voice vote the revision recommended by the Executive Committee in Article VII (13) of the Bylaws, making the Newsletter a standing committee.
 - c. The membership approved by voice vote the revision recommended by the Executive Committee in Article II (4) stipulating that applicants for Associate status shall be engaged primarily (rather than full-time) in professional or graduate work in industrial psychology.
 - d. The membership approved by a division of 39 to 23 the revision recommended by the Executive Committee in Article II (3) providing that applicants for Membership be presently engaged full-time in industrial psychology, and must have been so engaged for at least one year prior to application. Some members expressed the feeling that these were too stringent requirements, although it was pointed out that they were part of the standards currently in use by the Executive Committee, and that the Bylaws change only ratified current practice. Comment was invited in TIP, and it was agreed to discuss the matter in the Executive Committee.

2. Election Report. Marvin Dunnette reported the results of the election.
3. New Fellows. Clifford Jurgensen, on behalf of the Executive Committee, recommended to the membership, and it was approved unanimously, that the following be elected to Fellowship status in the Division:
Arthur A. Brayfield (Fellow, Div. 17)
John Knox Hemphill
Fred E. Fiedler (Fellow, Div. 8, 9)
4. Report on APA Council. Dr. Owens prepared a summary of a report of the Commission on Composition of Council. Dr. Seashore, who distributed the summary, said that Council discussion was postponed until its Tuesday meeting, and that the plan was to avoid a definitive vote on the proposals at this time. The main proposals were (1) that APA Council members be elected solely from Divisions, (2) that each APA member have only two votes for Council representative, (3) that a Division on Professional and Public Affairs be formed, (4) that Council size be limited, possibly to 100 members, with votes distributed on a proportional basis to fix Council numbers to this size.
5. New Members. Al Glickman reported on new member applications. The membership unanimously voted to approve the recommendations of the Executive Committee to vote into membership the following:
16 new Associates
43 new Members
6. Cattell Awards. Ross Stagner announced the following awards under the Third Annual Cattell Award Competition
First Prize: Benjamin Schneider and C. J. Bartlett
University of Maryland
"Individual and Organizational Patterns of Managerial Climate Attitudes: Predictive and Construct Validity."
Honorable Mention: Dallis K. Perry
Systems Development Corporation
"Salary Perceptions of Professional and Scientific Personnel"

7. Induction of New President. Ross Stagner introduced to the membership Marvin Dunnette, who assumed the gavel as President. Dr. Dunnette then introduced Dr. Stagner, who gave the Presidential Address, "Theory and Practice in Corporate Decision-Making."

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Ash
Secretary-Treasurer

Minutes of Outgoing
Executive Committee Meeting

September 2, 1966

New York, New York

Present: Ash, Bass, Baxter, Boulger, Buel, Glickman, Jurgensen, Keenen, Naylor, Owens, Parrish, Perloff, Petrullo, Prien, Seashore, Stagner, Vincent, Uhlaner

Absent: Dunnette, Mahler

1. Secretary-Treasurer Report

- a. Treasurer's Report. The Division's balance is \$2123.10. In compliance with an APA request, information concerning funds in the Workshop Account were forwarded to the Chief Accountant. These funds, however, will not be merged with Division funds (that is, deposited with APA).

2. Elections

Dr. Ash reported the election results as follows:

President-Elect	- Philip Ash
Secretary-Treasurer and Representative to APA Council (1966-1969)	- Herbert H. Meyer
Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee (1966-1969)	- Clifford Jurgensen

3. APA Council Reorganization

William Owens reported on the Council reorganization proposals (see Minutes of Business Meeting, September 4, 1966, Item 4). Dr. Owens said that there would be no vote at this APA meeting, and that the proposals seem to conform to Division 14 recommendations. The Executive Committee decided to leave its Representatives uninstructed. It was recommended that the Representatives caucus before the Tuesday meeting of APA Council.

4. Petitions for New Divisions

The Executive Committee approved a motion instructing its representatives to APA Council to raise no objection to the formation of two new divisions: The Division of Community Psychology and the Division of Behavioral Pharmacology.

5. Committee Reports

- a. Fellowship. Cliff Jurgensen reported that a job description of committee activities had been completed. Three individuals are being presented to the membership as Fellow candidates: Brayfield, Fiedler, and Hemphill.
- b. Workshop. Erich Prien reported that the Workshop took in over \$4200. After paying all expenses, the Workshop account will amount to over \$2700.
- c. Public Relations. Jay Uhlaner reported that the brochure "The Psychologist in Industry" is all rewritten. It remains for the Committee to think through bringing it to completion. The old brochure is obsolete, and Dr. Uhlaner expressed some concern about distributing it. The "Catalog of Life History Items" is now being published by The Richardson Foundation.
- d. Newsletter. John Boulger reported that the last issue of the Newsletter kept within the budget. The Committee discussed Bartlett's article (page 43, Volume 3, No. 3) on ABEPP. Dr. Boulger reported that he and Dr. Kelley will meet to take up the matter of an article for TIP responding to the Bartlett comment.
- e. Education and Training Committee. Jim Naylor reported no progress on the guidelines for Master's level education. The survey of academic industrial psychologists in non-psychology departments has been completed in cooperation with the Special Interest Activities Committee. Three hundred and eight questionnaires were mailed; 94 usable returns received by the end of August and a preliminary report will be made at a symposium on Sunday.
- f. Professional Affairs Committee. Bill Buel distributed a draft of an article, "Questionable Ethics or Poor Judgment?" prepared for publication in TIP. Dr. Buel also reported briefly on a number of cases involving possible ethical practice violations.

- g. Special Interest Activities Committee. Norm Vincent reported on cooperation with the Education and Training Committee (see above).
- h. Program Committee. Jim Keenan summarized briefly some aspects of the 1966 program.
- i. Scientific Affairs Committee. Next year's committee will review the outstanding projects before this committee and activities under the Cattell Award Fund.
- j. Membership Committee. Al Glickman reported that the Membership Committee was recommending 43 new Members and 16 new Associates.

Respectively submitted,

Philip Ash
Secretary-Treasurer

A Southerner told me of the product of a school system which had had much federal support who was in her later years in school before she learned that U.S. Grant was also an Army general.

* * * * *

And it must have been a conservative who said that it was a typist trained under the Poverty program who asked "Is water works two words or is there a hydrant between?"

* * * * *

There is a notice in this issue that it is time to apply for the ABEPP examinations. I do not know what, if any, monetary value can be placed on the Industrial ABEPP, but according to a recent issue of the Oregon Newsletter, the Oregon Merit System pays from \$420 to \$600 more to holders of ABEPP in their salary series staffing mental health centers.

Minutes of Incoming Executive Committee Meeting

September 5, 1966

Roosevelt Hotel, New York

Present: M. Dunnette, (Chairman), P. Ash, B. Bass, J. Boulger, C. Jurgensen, R. Perloff, S. Seashore, R. Stagner, H. Meyer (Secretary).

Committee Chairmen: - R. Guion, J. Keenan, Jr., E. Prien.

Absent: W. Mahler, W. Owens

1. Membership:

The need for further clarifying the definition of "Industrial Psychologist" in relation to membership requirements in Division 14 was discussed at some length. It was recognized that the character of work being carried out, and courses being taught, by psychologists dealing with human behavior in the world of work has been changing quite significantly in recent years. The Membership Committee was asked to re-study the definition problem and to report back to the Executive Committee in January. It was also suggested that an attempt be made to include on the Membership Committee psychologists in the Division who represent various fields of interests.

2. Program:

Several ideas were presented and discussed relating to the 1967 Division 14 program at APA. It was generally agreed that the Program Committee should continue its innovative efforts, recognizing that new approaches that are tried will not be rousing successes in every case. There was general consensus that the Idea Sessions scheduled in the 1966 Meeting were successful and that these should be continued. Since the 1967 APA meeting will be held in Washington, the suggestion was made that we might try to schedule a prominent representative from the Federal Government, such as from the Department of Labor, as a featured speaker. It was also suggested that we might consider a session on the history of Industrial Psychology, since next year will be the 75th anniversary of APA. The Committee favored continuing the practice of scheduling some joint programs with other Divisions, since this provides for greater breadth of subject matter covered and additional program time for the Division.

3. Scientific Affairs:

The need was recognized for some sort of formal description of the mission and duties of the Scientific Affairs Committee. This task will be assigned to the new SA Committee to be appointed within the next few weeks.

4. Support for Training in Industrial Psychology:

The perennial problem of finding sources of financial support for graduate students in the field of Industrial Psychology was considered. It was suggested and approved that an ad hoc committee should be established to develop sources of support in this area.

5. Fellowship Committee:

Cliff Jurgensen, who served as Chairman of the Fellowship Committee this past year, submitted a draft of "Requirements and Guidelines" for the Fellowship Committee Chairman for review of the Executive Committee. This includes a detailed list of duties for this Committee, including the dates when actions must be taken with regard to the processing of each nominee for fellowship.

6. Winter Executive Committee Meeting:

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held in Detroit on January 6 and 7, 1967.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert H. Meyer
Secretary-Treasurer

* * * * *

A Frivolous Briton

For Information---I-N-F.

Lafayette Journal and Courier, Oct. 18, 1966.

A frivolous Briton picked up his telephone and dialed G-O-D.

"Can I help you?" came a suave reply. He reported it to the General Post Office which told him it was the same numerical combination for information - I-N-F.

New Fellows, Members and Associates of Division 14

FELLOWS

Arthur A. Brayfield
Fred E. Fiedler
John K. Hemphill

MEMBERS

Charles Bahn	Victor Howard
Warren G. Bennis	Stephen P. Klein
Rudolph G. Berkhouse	Kenneth E. Knight
Stanley F. Bolin	Abraham K. Korman
Ogden Brown, Jr.	James E. Kuntz
Vernon E. Buck	Judith W. Loubet
John L. Butler	Gene S. Micheli
Jack A. Chambers	Paul J. Patinka
Dean C. Dauw	R. D. Pepler
Michael M. DeMann	David L. Peters
Paddy A. Doll	Alec Rodger
Eugene C. Edel	Ivan Ross
Terry Eisenberg	Thomas G. Roulette
Richard K. Eyman	Jeremy A. Sarchet
Victor Fields	John J. Sherwood
Donald C. Findlay	Norvelle G. Simmons, Jr.
Herbert P. Froehlich	Melton V. Smith
David C. Goodrich	Joseph A. Tucker, Jr.
Bruce F. Gordon	Karl E. Weick
Joan S. Guilford	Ronald C. Winkler
James W. Hill	Martin G. Wolf
	C. Michael York

ASSOCIATES

Byron R. Boyles	Watson S. Mason
Irving J. Budnoff	Richard W. Moore
Stephen J. Fitzsimmons	J. Stephen Morris
B. G. Gross	Harry E. Seidel, Jr.
William H. Gutow	William K. Showler
Dalva E. Hedlund	B. V. Smith
R. Stephen Jenks	Harry D. Wilfong
Myron L. Katz	Edward G. Ypma

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS AS A DIVISION 14 FELLOW

Douglas W. Bray, Chairman
Fellowship Committee
American Telephone & Telegraph Company

Division 14 is anxious to have Fellowship status in the Division conferred upon those who have made unusual and outstanding contributions. In order for this to happen, you must nominate such individuals; self-nomination is not allowed.

The first step in nomination is to secure a "Uniform Fellow Blank" from the chairman of the Division 14 Fellowship Committee or from Mrs. Jane D. Hildreth at APA headquarters in Washington. This form with all supporting material must reach the chairman of the Fellowship Committee no later than March 31, 1967.

Those nominated must be endorsed by three sponsors, all of whom must be Fellows of the APA and two of whom must be Fellows of Division 14. The nominator may be one of the sponsors if he is a Fellow. The nominator must, in any case, secure the sponsors.

In addition to sponsorship, the nominator is responsible for submitting documentation in support of the nomination. Thorough documentation is important as the nominee and the sponsors may not be well known to the APA Membership Committee which must take action after the nomination has cleared the Division 14 Executive Committee. The assistance of the nominee himself may be enlisted in securing documentation.

Each of these steps takes time and you should take action immediately on behalf of those you wish to nominate. Being a nominator is not completely effortless but it is an essential responsibility of the members if those who have made noteworthy contributions are to receive the status they deserve.

ANNOUNCEMENTS OF INTEREST

The 1966 Cattell Award Winner

Luigi Petrillo, Chairman of the Committee for Scientific Affairs announced that the first prize in the third annual Cattell Award Competition was awarded to Benjamin Schneider and C. J. Bartlett¹ of the University of Maryland for their proposal entitled "Individual and Organizational Patterns of Managerial Climate Attitudes: Predictive and Construct Validation."

Honorable mention was given to Dallas K. Perry, Systems Development Corporation, for his proposal "Salary Perceptions of Professional and Scientific Personnel." The Cattell award winners received \$500 and Dr. Perry an award of \$100.

The first Cattell award had been to Ernest J. McCormick of Purdue for his proposal "A Proposed Study of Job Dimensions," and the second award had been given for two proposals which were tied in the voting by the Committee, namely those submitted by Martin Dunnette and Milton Hakel of the University of Minnesota entitled "The Nature and Importance of Stereotype as a Basis for Decision Making for the Employment Interview," and that of Robert M. Guion, Bowling Green State University, "The Meaning of Work and the Motivation to Work."

In their winning proposal, Schneider and Bartlett point out "Traditionally, individual differences oriented psychologists in industry have concentrated their efforts on personnel topics while tending to ignore social and organizational factors, while researchers in areas such as leadership and morale have often neglected the techniques and methodology perfected over the years in the personnel area." They believe that to unite the two areas of differential and organizational psychology it "appears necessary to develop a measure which takes into account both the individual and the organization."

Schneider and Bartlett would, according to the proposal:

1. develop a measure of managerial climate attitudes which can be applied to both management of an organization as well as applicants for a position in the organization.

2. examine the agreement between the individual and the organization and develop a measure of individual compatibility to managerial climate.
3. search for moderator variables which can be used to increase the predictive efficiency of selection and placement effectiveness. (Measures of managerial climate attitudes are proposed as the source for such moderators.)

Schneider and Bartlett would also study the relationships between managerial climate attitudes and a criterion of organizational effectiveness and investigate inter-manager agreement regarding managerial climate and its relationship to organizational effectiveness.

The specific hypotheses to be tested are:

1. Compatibility with managerial climate will contribute significantly to the prediction of turnover of salesmen beyond that of present methods.
2. If compatibility does not add significantly to linear prediction of turnover, it may be a useful moderator.
3. Managerial climate attitudes should provide a source of moderators in the prediction of turnover.
4. Turnover rate is related to managerial climate attitudes.
5. In organizations with more than one management person the degree of agreement as to managerial climate will be related to turnover rate.

To provide an adequate test for the hypotheses, a large number of similarly engaged organizations with a wide variety of managerial climates is necessary, and Schneider and Bartlett suggest that the insurance industry, with its nationwide network of sales agencies, might provide this kind of setting.

J.B.

¹At the APA convention, Jack Bartlett pointed out that the name of the co-author of the proposal was omitted from handout distributed at the Division 14 Business meeting.

NEW AWARDS

The McKinsey Foundation for Management Research

Since 1952 a sponsor of research and publications in areas of interest to managers of large enterprises, The McKinsey Foundation for Management Research announces two new annual awards. These awards have been established to encourage original research in universities and independent research institutes on problems and issues involving top management.

A Post-Doctoral Fellowship will be given for an outstanding doctoral dissertation that is concerned with the social or analytical processes of top management. The \$4,000 Post-Doctoral Fellowship is intended to assist the recipient in continuing his research and publishing his findings so that managers and others can benefit from his work. Only dissertations that have been accepted during the calendar year 1966 are eligible for this Fellowship. Two honorable mentions of \$500 each may be given for other outstanding entries.

A Research Design Award will be given the author of a proposed design for the study of a major management problem, rather than for a completed project. Through this \$1,000 Award, the Foundation hopes to encourage the development of new approaches to management research—approaches that utilize and advance the methods now being developed in the social sciences and in applied mathematics. Two honorable mentions of \$500 each may be given to other designs of exceptional quality.

A committee composed of Kenneth R. Andrews, Harvard University, Marvin D. Dunnette, University of Minnesota, Robert B. Fetter, Yale University, and James G. March, University of California, Irvine will select the Fellowship and Research Design Award recipients. They will evaluate the submitted dissertations and research designs in terms of the following criteria:

The normative value of the dissertation or research design for top-management decision making

The usefulness and relevance of the dissertation or design for social and management scientists and for management research

The originality and predictive power of the model and

the suitability of the controls and measurements for testing it

Clarity of exposition.

Entries for the McKinsey Fellowship and Research Design Awards should be submitted in quadruplicate to Robert J. House, Executive Director of the McKinsey Foundation for Management Research, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017. A 700-word abstract should accompany research designs and dissertations. The abstract should include a description of the major focus of the study, the model or procedures used, major conclusions, and the reasons for considering the study a significant contribution to the understanding of the social or analytical processes of top management.

Dissertations must be submitted by the adviser of the doctoral candidate before January 1, 1967. Research designs, which may be entered by the author, must be submitted before February 15, 1967. Once submitted, all entries are final. Announcement of the recipients of both Awards will be made in April, 1967.

Cattell Postdoctoral Fellowships

The trustees of the James McKeen Cattell Fund announce their intention to award one or more postdoctoral fellowships to psychologists employed in government or industry. The purpose of the fellowship is to permit the person to take sabbatical leave and return to an academic setting for a period of study or productive scholarship. It is the intention of the Trustees that, within limits, the grantee be supported during the fellowship at his current rate of pay. For further information write to: Robert L. Thorndike, James McKeen Cattell Fund, Box 219, 525 West 120th Street, New York, N.Y. 10027.

OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

ABEPP: Applications for Candidacy

The American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology, Inc., is now accepting applications for admission to its 1967 written examination. Applications will be reviewed as soon as supporting materials are assembled and candidates will be informed concerning admission.

Final date for making application is February 1.

In meeting the postdoctoral experience requirement of four years, the Board will count experience to December 31 of the year in which the applicant wishes to register for written examination.

ABEPP has prepared a statement entitled Policies and Procedures. This pamphlet gives specific information on requirements for candidacy, fields of certification, the nature of acceptable qualifying experience, and evaluative procedures, including written and oral examinations and policies governing these examinations. Requests for information should be addressed to Noble H. Kelley, (Ph.D., Executive Officer, American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

* * * * *

The University of Oregon School of Business Administration announced that John B. Miner will be on leave during the 1966-67 academic year to serve as Visiting Professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of California at Berkeley. During the same period of time and during the summer of 1967 he will also serve as research advisor in behavioral science to the San Francisco office of McKinsey and Company.

* * * * *

Rohrer, Hibler, and Replogle have announced the opening of an office in Indianapolis and that Charles A. Boswell is resident partner there.

Harry Laurent has accepted an appointment as Advisor, Personnel Development of Esso Europe, Inc., and has moved to London.

* * * * *

James W. Hill, formerly Research Associate, Psychology and Personnel Division, Detroit Edison, has joined the staff of Southern Illinois University.

* * * * *

Martin G. Wolf has been appointed Industrial Psychologist with the Dallas office of Lifson, Wilson, Ferguson and Winick, Inc.

* * * * *

Frederick O. Carleton has accepted a position with Sohio in Cleveland.

* * * * *

Change of Address Procedure

Members should NOT send address changes to TIP, since we use address tapes which we purchase from the American Psychological Association.

But on the other hand, if all members did this, then I probably would not learn as quickly that:

Donald G. Livingston has left Middlesex England for Morristown, New Jersey.

Mary Hopkins has left Texas Western for Hawaii University.

John K. Hemphill has left Princeton for Oakland, Calif.

John C. Flanagan has left Pittsburgh for Palo Alto.

P.C. and O.W. Smith are now at Bowling Green.

Frank Friedlander has left China Lake, California for Cleveland, Ohio.

And then the one that caused me to muse:

William Askren asked that his mailing address be changed from one on "Colonel Glenn Highway, Dayton, O." to "266 Shady Lane, Dayton." In these days of concern about image, why would a psychologist do that?

The Cattell Award

The Division of Industrial Psychology of the American Psychological Association is pleased to announce the fourth annual James McKeen Cattell award to be given for the best research design in which basic scientific methods are applied to problems in business and industry.

The \$500 award is given for a research design rather than a completed project because the Division wishes to encourage psychologists to make creative and rigorous approaches to industrial problems untrammelled by considerations of the availability of resources for their implementation.

Entries and inquiries about the competition should be sent to the Chairman of the Cattell Award at the following address:

Dr. Patricia Cain Smith
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

The Executive Study Conference

At the Fall Executive Study Conference held November 15-16 in Chicago, several members of the Division presented papers on the theme of the conference "Motivation of Managers." These members were:

Henry D. Meyer, Jewel Companies, Inc., "The Development and Study of Three Objective Achievement Motivation Scales in Management Personnel Assessment."

Marvin D. Dunnette, University of Minnesota, "Identification and Emergence of Management Effectiveness."

Donald L. Grant, American Telephone and Telegraph, "Influence of Motivation on Progress in Management; Retention and Development."

In addition to a panel discussion by three plant managers, George Litwin of the Harvard Business discussed "Motivation and Organization Climate; Norman Frederiksen, Educational Testing Service, spoke on "Some Effects of Organization Climates on Administrative Performance."

Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Symposium on Personnel Research and Systems Advancement

Six Fellows of the Division participated in the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary symposium on Personnel Research and Systems Advancement sponsored by the Personnel Research Laboratory held Nov. 1-3 in San Antonio, Texas. Members presented the following papers:

John C. Flanagan, "Evolution of Method in Personnel Research."

Julius E. Uhlaner and Arthur J. Drucker, "Recent Personnel Research in the U.S. Army Personnel Research Office in Job Systems Settings."

Ernest J. McCormick, "Opportunities for Research in the Military Services."

S. Rains Wallace, "A Future Look at Personnel Research."
Harold A. Edgerton, "Recent Personnel Research in Industry: A Review."

The proceedings of the conference will be available later and should be a must reading for industrial psychology graduate students. As Launor Carter said in his paper, "The continuous activities in personnel research and operations of the Air Force Personnel Research Laboratory over a period of twenty-five years is a great tribute to the many people who have served so well at this important personnel research center."

Honors and Recognition of Industrial Psychologists

At the APA Convention it was announced that Ernest J. McCormick was the winner of the Franklin V. Taylor Award, granted each year as one of the highest honors by the Society of Engineering Psychologists and that Bob Perloff, first Editor of TIP is President-Elect of the Division of Consumer Psychology.

* * * * *

In the current issue of TIP, it is mentioned that Marv Dunnette is on the Selection Committee for two new awards of the McKinsey Foundation for Management Research.

Carroll L. Shartle is a member of a new Research Advisory Committee for the U.S. Employment Service. The Committee has been assigned the tasks of improving national job-market information and seeking better ways of measuring effectiveness of USES. It will conduct a full-scale study of USES research programs. The Committee has been set up on the recommendation of a 15-member Task Force appointed last year by Labor Secretary Wirtz.

* * * * *

Al Glickman and Francis Harmon, Personnel Research Staff, U.S. Department of Agriculture received the Louis Brownlow Memorial Award at the opening session of the Public Personnel Association's 1966 International Conference in Washington, D.C. The award is for the outstanding article appearing in the Public Personnel Review during 1965. Their article is entitled "Managerial Training: Reinforcement Through Evaluation."

* * * * *

Donald A. Laird has been honored by having his name incorporated into the name of a \$475,000 library building at the University of Dubuque. Dr. Laird contributed the largest single gift for the library at his Alma Mater--\$100,000 and in addition, established a trust fund which will assist in delaying payments on the government loan. Dr. Laird, author of over 20 books and hundreds of articles, is an APA Fellow, and Industrial Diplomat, but not a member of the Division.

* * * * *

The Indiana Psychological Association presented the Gordon A. Barrows Memorial Award to Joseph Tiffin for his "distinguished contributions to psychology" at their annual meeting November 11.

* * * * *

Norman L. Vincent, formerly Director of Agency Research, is now Assistant Vice President-Agency with State Farm Insurance Companies, Bloomington, Illinois.

Erich Prien has prepared a supplement to his and William Ronan's bibliography dealing with Criterion Development and Measurement in Personnel and Industrial Psychology. Those wishing a copy, without charge, may write him:

Dr. Erich P. Prien
Department of Psychology
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44304

Since HEW has formed a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism and named a man from the University of Kentucky Medical School as Chairman, perhaps the Committee should make more explicit its aim---are they pro or con?

NEWS FROM ACADEMIA

The Management Research Center of the University of Pittsburgh

The Management Research Center of the Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, has been created to conduct studies in managerial and organizational psychology. Bernard M. Bass has been appointed Director; James A. Vaughan will serve as Associate Director. Research advisors include Harold J. Leavitt, Victor H. Vroom and Ted Van Wormer.

A three-year grant of \$270,000 from the Ford Foundation has made possible the development and maintenance of an international data bank of information on the performance of managers from various European countries in standardized organizational simulations, such as the Program of Exercises in Management and Organizational Psychology. European data will come from management training centers in Norway, Sweden, Holland, Germany, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Great Britain, Spain and Italy, coordinated by the European Research Group on Management (ERGOM) with offices at 53 Rue de la Concorde, Brussels. ERGOM is a working group of the European Association of Management Training Centers. Professor Leopold Vansina of Louvain will serve as European coordinator. Included on ERGOM's Advisory Council are: Jose Rodriguez-Porrás, Mirella Ducceschi, Claude Faucheux, Herman Hutte, Eric Rhenman, Harold Leavitt, Reginald Revans, and Bernard Bass (ex officio). Charles J. Cox is Council Secretary. A grant of \$29,000 from the International Dimensions Fund has permitted the beginning of a similar project in Latin America, assisted by Mathilde Kejner of the University of Cordoba. Data collection also is underway at selected sites in India, Israel and the United States.

Other projects of the Management Research Center are supported by ONR. These include studies of the impact of computers on management, surveys of the consulting patterns of managers, and studies of business conflict resolution.

Call for Nominations for Division 14 Offices

ELECTED OFFICERS OF THE DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY

President	Secretary-Treasurer	Division Representative	Member-at-large Exec. Committee
Henry, E. R.	Taylor, E. K.	1956-57 Taylor, E. L. Tiffin, J. Wallace, S. R. Baier, D. E.	Blum, M. L. Baxter, B. McGehee, W.
Lawshe, C. H.	Crissey, O. L.	1957-58 Tiffin, J. Wallace, S. R. Baier, D. E. Crissey, O. L.	Baxter, B. McGehee, W. Katzell, R. A.
Tiffin, J.	Crissey, O. L.	1958-59 Baier, D. E. Crissey, O. L. Baxter, B. Stagner, R.	McGehee, W. Katzell, R. A. Moore, J. E.
Taylor, E. K.	Crissey, O. L.	1959-60 Crissey, O. L. Baxter, B. Stagner, R. Blum, M. L.	Niven, J. A. Moore, J. E. Meyer, H. H.
Katzell, R. A.	Baxter, B.	1960-61 Baxter, B. Stagner, R. Blum, M. L. Niven, J. R.	Moore, J. E. Meyer, H. H. Ely, J. H.
Crissey, O. L.	Baxter, B.	1961-62 Baxter, B. Blum, M. L. Dunnette, M. D. Niven, J.	Ely, J. H. McCormick, E. J. Meyer, H. H.
McGehee, W.	Baxter, B.	1962-63 Baxter, B. Ash, P. Dunnette, M. D. Meyer, H. H.	Ely, J. H. McCormick, E. J. Fleishman, E. A.
Wallace, S. R.	Ash, P.	1963-64 Ash, P. Dunnette, M. D. Owens, W. A. Meyer, H. H.	McCormick, E. J. Fleishman, E. A. Stagner, R.
Baxter, B.	Ash, P.	1964-65 Ash, P. Meyer, H. H. Owens, W. A. Seashore, S. E.	Fleishman, E. A. Bass, B. Mahler, W. R.
Stagner, R.	Ash, P.	1965-66 Ash, P. Owens, W. A. Seashore, S. E. Bass, B.	Parrish, J. A. Mahler, W. R. Perloff, R.
Dunnette, M. D.	Meyer, H. H.	1966-67 Meyer, H. H. Bass, B. Owens, W. A. Seashore, S. E.	Jurgensen, C. E. Mahler, W. R. Perloff, R.

Note: Refer also to membership of Division 14 listed in the Directory.

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY AT COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

George Thornton
Assistant Professor

The graduate program in industrial psychology at Colorado State University is designed to give the student a strong academic foundation in general and industrial psychology. At the same time, the application of the principles and methods of these disciplines to the problems of business and industry is stressed through seminars, practicum experiences, and directed research. Both a master's and Ph.D. degree are offered.

Admissions requirements are similar to those of other comparable graduate programs. In addition to the application and transcript of prior academic work required by the Graduate School, each applicant is required to submit to the Department of Psychology three letters of recommendation and scores from the Miller Analogies Test or the Graduate Record Examination.

Each graduate student's program of coursework is tailored to fit his individual needs. To assure that each student has sufficient breadth, however, certain courses are required of all students.

Required coursework in psychology for Master of Science:

CORE:	23 quarter hours
Py 130	- Social Psychology
Py 136	- Psychology of Personality
Py 152	- Learning
*Py 153	- Sensation and Perception
*Py 155	- Motivation and Emotion
Py 160	- Introduction to Abnormal Psychology
Py 206	- Interpretation of Psychological Tests
Py 225	- Methods of Research in Psychology

* 1 course required

INDUSTRIAL: 11 quarter hours

Py 149	- Consumer Psychology
Py 150	- Industrial Psychology
Py 235	- Practicum in Industrial Psychology

Py 260 - Seminar in Industrial Psychology

ELECTIVES: 11 quarter hours

In addition, the following coursework is required for the Ph.D.:

CORE: 18 quarter hours

- Py 202 - Construction of Psychological Tests
- Py 220 - Theories of Personality
- Py 226 - Correlation Analysis in Psychological Research
- Py 228 - Design & Interpretation of Psychological Research
- *Py 252 - Theories of Learning
- *Py 253 - Theories of Perception and Thinking
- *Py 255 - Theories of Motivation and Emotion

* 2 courses required

INDUSTRIAL: 17 quarter hours

- Py 226 - Correlation Analysis in Psychological Research
- Py 235-6 hours--Practicum in Industrial Psychology
- Py 250 - Advanced Industrial Psychology
- Py 260-4 hours--Seminar in Industrial Psychology

ELECTIVES: 28 quarter hours

If a student has taken any of the foregoing courses or their equivalent as an undergraduate or graduate student, he may substitute other coursework in his program.

Written comprehensive examinations are required of all Ph.D. candidates. These examinations include a major in industrial, a minor in general experimental, a minor in statistics and experimental design, and one other minor.

No language examination is required for the Master of Science degree. Two languages are required for the Ph.D. French, German, Russian, Spanish, or other languages may be used to satisfy these requirements.

A thesis is required for the MS degree, and a dissertation for the Ph.D. degree. In both cases these will customarily be a report of an experimental investigation.

Of particular interest is the exposure that each student

obtains, to the practical problems encountered in industry. This exposure is provided through the practicum courses, research assistantships, and part-time and summer employment.

A notable flexibility is built into the program in the form of the seminar course (Py 260). This course allows response to the current problems in industrial psychology through an intensive review and analysis of specific topics. Thus, in recent quarters, the seminar has studied selection interviewing, industrial training, automobile accidents and safety, personnel selection, T-group training, etc.

* * * * *

The Care and Feeding of Graduate Students:
A Graduate Student View
Benjamin Schneider - University of Maryland

September marked the beginning and June the end of my five year project of graduate training in Industrial Psychology culminating, hopefully, in the receipt of a Ph.D. On completing any such long-term project, thoughts naturally turn to what the struggle has meant, to whether or not it has any current meaning, and to what it will mean in the future. With time now available for such thoughts (after completion of "comps", core courses, term papers, etc.) the author ventures to express a graduate students' view regarding the education of Industrial Psychologists.

It appears interesting that few, if any, graduate students' views on this topic have been published since undoubtedly all can remember occasion for such ruminations while in school. Academicians and others have publicly voiced their opinions on their approach to, and feelings about, how education should be accomplished, but those intimately involved have not expressed what they believe is received nor what they feel they have a right to expect.

Believing that analogies are one of the clearest methods for stating opinions and conclusions, the question of education will be attacked from two vantage points: (1) training; and, (2) test construction.

TRAINING. The aim of any training program is to provide the skills, knowledges, and attitudes necessary for successful performance (McGehee, 1958). Where the task is simple, the training can be simple; i.e., limited to the acquisition of skills. Where the task is complex, the training must follow suit. Industrial Psychologists perform complex tasks, and this requires complex skills, knowledges and attitudes to satisfy the multidimensional demands of the job. Worrying about the acquisition of skills and knowledge is not as much the concern here as is the promotion and absorption of attitudes conducive to the development of research scientists. This is no small issue, since over the past few years there has been a great deal of talk about a professional degree in Industrial Psychology. This degree would foster the concept of training in its most limited sense—the teaching of specific skills. The broader view of training (education), in which the objectives relate to proficiency in future situations by providing a basis for learning through experience, would not exist. Psychologists, as scientists, must be made aware of the fact that there really does exist a body of scientific literature labeled Psychology; that they are scientists and in this capacity owe to their science the obligation of contributing knowledge to and about the understanding of human behavior. A professional degree would, to be sure, produce experts ready to answer any and all questions based on the large fund of knowledge acquired in earning their degree. The attitude would be that there is an answer to a problem, not that the solution to the problem must be researched.

Recently Porter (1966) has spoken of an integrated approach to some of the problems in personnel management; a professional would only know one approach. Stagner (1966) views the industrial psychologist as being any research psychologist working in the industrial area; the “expert” would stagnate the discipline by knowing answers, not finding solutions. This know-it-all, research-it-never attitude would kill the discipline because of the overwhelming emphasis on specific knowledges and the failure to emphasize general attitudes. There is no doubt that academicians must present the multidimensional approach and that students must avail themselves of all they can. Not to be let off the hook, the practicing industrial psychologist, the man faced with the everyday problems of an applied scientist, must contribute his attitudes. He must speak with, encourage and teach students about not only the technical aspects of his profession, but also the attitudes with which it should be approached. Only through a rigorous attitude-building experience of varied

training will there be any point in arguing whether or not a professional degree or a Ph.D. is to be granted.

TEST CONSTRUCTION. When a test is constructed, reliability and validity are the hoped-for products. The former is often achieved by increased length and/or achieving a high degree of homogeneity. Length of course can make the test impossible to complete while internal consistency can be so high as to make the instrument unidimensional.

The second element of test construction is validity. There are two kinds of validity; (1) baloney; and, (2) cross-validity (Cureton, 1950). It seems that while every good psychologist knows that validity cannot exceed the square root of reliability, there is a tendency to forget that it (validity) is under no obligation to equal the square root of reliability; that a reliable test is not a valid test.

Graduate education is a construction process, and education must be built of many forms of materials. Reliability of training should not be so internally consistent as to be unidimensional. Skills and knowledge can be taught to monkeys and pigeons but attitudes can best be shaped in humans. The type of professional the professional degree would yield would be internally consistent, homogenous and unidimensional. He would be unable to cope with the multidimensional, heterogenous nature of industrial psychology. A professional degree would give baloney; it would not stand up under cross-validation simply because it would not be able to account for the dimensional problems associated with the criteria of returning understanding for knowledge received.

Think for a moment of a professional attempting to construct a training program without having studied the principles-of-learning research and methodology by such men as Sidman (1960) and Terrace (1963). Can communication patterns be taught without knowing what a small group is (or even attempting to answer the question of whether or not there is such a thing?). Maybe Piaget's model of child development might help explain the acquisition of complex motor skills. The professional could not be cognizant of such problems.

When constructing a test, all the possible variability in the criterion must be accounted for in the validation (earning the degree) so that cross-validation (contributing to the

understanding of human behavior) will be successful. There is no happy medium. For the author the past five years have meant variability in training; items that tap many dimensions have been built-in. The past five years mean that there is such a thing as Psychology. The past five years will mean that there is hope the author will stand up under cross-validation.

Variability, multidimensionality, must be demanded by students and be the byword of educators. Anything and everything must be read and/or assigned. All manner of research must be challenged and much of it must be replicated. The training and construction of Industrial Psychologists must not yield baloney.

References

- Cureton, E. Validity, reliability and baloney. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 1950, 10, 94-96.
- McGehee, W. Are we using what we know about training?- Learning theory and training. Personnel Psychology, 1958, 11, 1-12.
- Porter, L. W. Personnel management. Annual Review of Psychology, 1966, 17, 395-422.
- Sidman, M. Tactics of Scientific Research. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Stagner, R. New design for industrial psychology. Contemporary Psychology, 1966, 11, 145-150.
- Terrace, H. S. Discrimination learning with and without errors. Journal of Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 1963, 6, 1-27.

PROFESSIONAL NOTES

Questionable Ethics or Poor Judgment?

W. D. Buel

Division 14 Professional Affairs Committee

Over the relatively short life of the Professional Affairs Committee, a committee charged, among other things, with monitoring alleged areas of ethical transgression, the committee has discovered relatively few situations smacking of outright unethical behavior. However, in many cases it has been faced with situations requiring educative action, that is, individuals and/or organizations (most notably consultants) about whom the committee has received complaints are judged to have exercised poor judgment in the preparation of brochures, promotional statements, and manuals accompanying psychometric instruments. It is the purpose of this note to point out several areas where poor judgment or "ethical ignorance" has operated and to relate them to the specific clause within the Ethical Standards of Psychologists which treats that situation.

This committee most frequently receives complaints related to statements which lead the prospective client to expect unique expertise from a psychologist or more favorable outcomes from the use of that psychologist's instruments than can reasonably be expected. In this context, we call attention to the Ethical Standards of Psychologists, Principle 10, wherein it is clearly stated that "Claims that a psychologist has unique skills or unique devices not available to others in the profession are made only if the special efficacy of these unique skills or devices has been demonstrated by scientifically acceptable evidence" and "The psychologist must not encourage (nor, within his power, even allow) a client to have exaggerated ideas as to the efficacy of services rendered." Also, in relation to proprietary tests and evaluative instruments and the descriptive statements made about them, Principle 15 states as a necessary condition that "Limitations upon the test's dependability, and aspects of its validity on which research is lacking or incomplete, are clearly stated." Further, under the same Principle we note that "Test advertisements are factual and descriptive rather than emotional and persuasive." Finally, in a similar spirit,

Principle 19 points out that "Claims regarding performance, benefits, or results are supported by scientifically acceptable evidence." A significant portion of the complaints directed to this committee's attention relate to situations where these conditions have not been satisfied - they would appear to arise where the author of the promotional piece, brochure, or test manual has left too much for the prospective client to infer.

In a related vein, and represented by a frequency of complaints almost equal to the area discussed above, we find concern relating to those situations where a brochure or promotional piece includes statements relative to the quality of the psychological services described. Under Principle 10 we note that "A psychologist or agency announcing nonclinical professional services may use brochures that are descriptive of services rendered but not evaluative." It is unacceptable to make "value" statements about the goodness of the available psychological services or the desirability of outcomes resulting from the use of such services.

Principle 10 states that "The use in a brochure of "testimonials from satisfied users" is unacceptable." Not infrequently brochures, mail pieces, and promotional statements cite plaudits from "satisfied users." This is unacceptable, and while the prospective client is at liberty to solicit "reference checks" about a psychologist or consulting firm from organizations which that individual or group may presently serve, it is not within the psychologist's purview to provide the prospective client with those "reference checks." Finally, some psychologists whose materials have been printed by commercial organizations have pleaded that they were not aware of printed statements made by the publisher about their materials. Principle 19 is specific in stating that "The psychologist associated with the development or promotion of psychological devices, books, or other products offered for commercial sale is responsible for insuring that such devices, books, or products are presented in a professional and factual way."

As is clear, these matters are almost as much a function of taste and judgment as they are of a knowledge of a code of ethics. Many responses from individuals about whom the Professional Affairs Committee has chosen to inquire, and we believe these individuals are sincere, have indicated that they had not construed their statements in the light pointed out by our inquiry, and they have generally conceded the

ambiguity or possibility of misunderstanding and misrepresentation inherent in their statements. In the context of this note it may make sense to conceive of psychologists as professionally non-competitive, one with another - that it is neither necessary nor permissible for a psychologist to describe his services or devices in a way which explicitly compares them to the general sorts of services elsewhere available - implicit comparison is almost impossible to avoid. While industries and individuals "marketing" a product frequently make such comparisons, such is not within the pale of professional behavior.

Our committee hopes that this brief review will assist industrial psychologists, and particularly consultants, in more precisely describing and presenting their services in keeping with the Ethical Standards of Psychologists.

With the great interest in questions of invasion of privacy, psychologists might like to know of this suggestion as a rule for direct mail advertising proposed in Advertising Age of November 7, 1966.

"Use the wrong address: He (Mr. Poltoon) said he tried this technique in 1963, sending a mailing to every single home in Sugar City, Ida., with letters addressed, for example, to Clyde Fitch who lived at 16 Spruce St., but "we sent it to 18 Spruce St., the house next door... and we marked the envelope 'personal and confidential' in big letters.

"Well, just ask yourself what you'd do if you got a letter like that...Before you took it next door, you'd steam it open and read what was inside. But it takes a lot of fuss and bother to steam open an envelope...So, you know what was inside those envelopes when people got them steamed open? It was an ad for new patented instant envelope steamer. Well, you know almost 50% of the homes in Sugar City wound up buying one."

Commission on Composition of Council

One of the current "hot topics" being discussed is "Composition of Council." The Commission on the Composition of Council was appointed by Nicholas Hobbs in May, 1966 at the recommendation of the Council of Representatives. During the Council's Spring meeting, extensive discussions were held on the problem of the composition of Council. The Commission was charged with recommending changes in the method of electing members to Council and were given a number of guidelines by Council to follow in their deliberations. The Commission met during the Spring and Summer and discussed the problem of governing structure of the Association and drafted a report which will be published in the American Psychologist in the December issue.

The Board of Directors and the Council of Representatives of the Association voted to continue the Commission's existence for another year. During this time the Commission has been directed to seek as full and open discussion as possible of their recommendations. They are to collect reactions, suggestions, comments, and proposals for changes from the State Associations, from the Divisions, and from the membership at large.

Bill Owens, Division 14's representative on the commission has prepared the following summary of the proposal's of the commission:

- (a) favor divisional representation over state; (b) consider a differential dues structure as one means of lessening professional vs. scientific tensions; (c) strive to implement some version of the one-man one-vote principle; (d) bend all efforts to avoid a split in APA.

The Proposal

As a consequence of our examination of the forces within the Association and of various alternative solutions we agree on the following recommendations which we will report to Council and to the Policy and Planning Board:

1. That Council members should be elected solely from Divisions.

Discussion: The Commission discussed seriously and at length all of the alternatives, from the abolition of Council altogether, to the establishment of two houses, to repre-

sentation solely from States, representation from neither states nor divisions but from place of employment, etc. A consensus was finally reached that a single basis of representation made the most sense and that divisional representation was preferable. Some of the present Divisions, however, are really interest groups formed for the purpose of communication on substantive or administrative matters; therefore, that not all Divisions must be represented in Council.

2. That each member may belong to as many Divisions as he wishes, and for which he has the necessary qualifications, as at present. But that each member will have an equal opportunity to have his interests represented on Council by choosing two Divisions through which he wants to be represented on Council.

Discussion: Each member will choose any two Divisions through which he wants to be represented on Council. He need not be a member of these Divisions, but only members of the Divisions themselves will nominate and vote for divisional representatives on Council and for other divisional offices. This means that a member of the Association conceivably could choose to be represented through two Divisions to which he does not belong. Under normal circumstances he would choose two of the Divisions to which he belongs, and for which he feels the closest attachment, and that he believes would best represent his interests.

Members would have to decide each year at the time of their annual dues statement as to the two Divisions they wished to represent them the following year. The Commission had to wrestle with the problem of the possible change in the number of representatives from Divisions each year, and with the possibility that elections for Council would have to be held each year.

We believe that a relatively simple solution to this problem is available. Each Division will be instructed to elect Representatives to Council for the ordinary three year terms. The number of Representatives serving from a Division each year will be based on the number of members choosing that Division for their representation. Any Representatives elected by the Division but not needed during a given year would serve as Alternates.

This procedure is less complicated than it sounds. When the representational choices of members are counted at the end of the year for Divisional representation, each Division will be informed before the nomination and elec-

tion ballots are mailed out in the Spring as to how many representatives will be serving from that Division that year. Adjustments in the numbers of nominees placed on the final ballot can be made in plenty of time to provide additional delegates if necessary. In the case of Divisions allocated fewer delegates in the particular year, their delegates can be changed from active to alternate status if their three year terms have not been completed.

3. The Commission recommends that there be established a Division on Professional and Public Affairs.

Discussion: While a Division cannot be formed except through the concerted action of members of the Association, we believe a Division of Professional and Public Affairs should be formed to provide for representation in Council of all of those interests of professional psychologists that were elaborated above. There is a possibility that one of the existing Divisions might become the Division on Professional and Public Affairs. (There was some sentiment among Commission members for the alternate name, Division of State and Local Affairs.)

At the present time representation on Council from the State Associations does not ensure that these action interests are fairly and proportionally represented.

With each member allotted two Divisions through which he chooses to be represented on Council, every member would be expected to choose a Division representing his substantive interest in psychology, but he would also have the opportunity to choose to be represented through the Division of Professional and Public Affairs if he felt strongly about the need for augmented Associational activity in this area. A Division of Professional and Public Affairs would have the option, as does any Division, of collecting additional funds from its members. Individual APA members could opt for representation through this (or any) Division whether they were members of the Division or not. (It is possible, of course, that this Division might limit its membership to State and Local Association officers, but solicit votes for representation from APA members generally. We cannot foresee the organizational structure of a Division not yet in existence.)

The present proposal will permit interested and concerned members to act in concert about such problems as legislation, certification, insurance, Medicare, government mental health center regulations, and others that are thought by so many to require more time and effort from organized psychology than they have been receiving.

It will also enable those persons, and related affiliated organizations, to help provide additional funds supporting these activities. Nor need these activities have the effect of reducing traditional APA activities--publications, frequency of meetings, and other academically and scientifically oriented activities. Rather they should further these efforts.

We have assumed that those concerned with the "practical" problems must be provided with an avenue of communication and influence, and that those not so concerned must not be taxed beyond their willingness to pay.

4. The Commission suggests that the size of Council be set arbitrarily at a number small enough to provide for effective functioning.

Discussion: For illustrative purposes let us choose one hundred members as the optimal size of Council.

Under the present By-Laws, any Division receiving one per cent of the Association's voting membership is entitled to one seat on Council. We would propose retaining this arrangement. This means that any Division presently receiving opting votes requesting representation by one per cent of members eligible to vote would have one seat on Council.

In order to give fair and democratically proportional representation to the various interest groups within the Association we would also suggest eliminating the present "damping arrangement" that requires increasingly large increments in divisional membership for single increases in delegates. In other words, we would propose that a Division have as many delegates to the Council (of predetermined size) as it merits on the basis of the number of members requesting representation through the Division.

We would expect that perhaps twenty of the present Divisions would have at least one seat on Council by attracting enough opting votes from members.

The remaining hypothetical eighty seats would be divided in direct proportion to the number of members opting to be represented through the specific Divisions.

If one Division received votes representing forty per cent of the membership, for example, it would be assigned forty per cent of the remaining eighty seats which with its original seat would total thirty-three seats on a one hundred member Council.

The Commission has agreed strongly that program time at the annual meeting should be available to Divisions without regard to their representation on Council. We

believe that everything possible should be done to separate divisional program interest from governmental responsibilities in the affairs of the Association.

Implementation

In the discussion between members of the Commission and of the Policy and Planning Board there evolved the feeling that it would be better to work toward a terminal point of the present arrangement for election of representatives, rather than toward a Gradual implementation of the proposed plan. For these reasons we recommend that:

(1) All representation on Council be through Divisions at the end of a three year period following the adoption by the membership of a set of formal By-laws changes embodying the essential recommendations in this report.

(2) That a Division of Professional and Public Affairs be encouraged to develop during this three year period for the purposes of representing those professional interests as presently perceived by state and local associations. The details of working out membership requirements and structure should be left to this Division as it organizes.

(3) We would also recommend that a trial "opting" be carried out with the next dues statement (the list to include the proposed Division of Professional Affairs with a description of its probable purposes and functions) in order that the Policy and Planning Board may obtain an empirical membership response that will give them information necessary to work out a more clear-cut description of the probable results of this plan for presentation to the membership.

(4) In the interim between the adoption of the plan, and the time when it takes effect, we recommend that the new Division add representatives to the present Council under the provisions of the present By-Laws, and that the states continue to be represented as at present.

Dr. Owens would appreciate hearing from Division 14 members about their reaction to the above proposal, or to the complete report.

Report on Traineeship in Industrial Psychology

The August 1965 issue of TIP announced an establishment of an initial Traineeship in Industrial Psychology by the Humble Oil and Refining Company in cooperation with the University of Houston. The announcement noted that "the first trainee assumed his duties on March 15, so it is too early to evaluate the effectiveness of the program."

The first trainee has now completed his tour with good acceptance by line and staff of Humble and with research experience which culminated in part in a paper given at the 1966 APA convention. The second trainee is now aboard and is setting up his plans for the year. A side effect of the first trainee was the summer employment of still another industrial psychology graduate student from the University of Houston by one of Humble's major refineries.

Perhaps the next comments should come from the trainees themselves; but it is obvious that Humble's management is sold on the program.

"THE PSYCHOLOGIST IN INDUSTRY"--Revision

J. E. Uhlaner, Chairman
Public Relations Committee

As a Committee project for 1965-66, and extending into 1966-67, the Public Relations Committee, with the approval of the Executive Committee of Division 14, undertook the revision of the pamphlet The Psychologist In Industry, first published by the Public Relations Committee in 1959, for the purpose of acquainting the public with the role of the industrial psychologist.

The updating of this pamphlet was necessitated by the rapid developments of the last six or seven years, both within the professional field and in the public aura surrounding the activities of that field.

Contributions to the pamphlet have been received from members of Division 14 who are outstanding leaders in the specific areas of concentration covered in the pamphlet. Today's major areas in which the industrial psychologist functions include Personnel Selection and Job Placement, Management Development, Counseling, Employee Motivation, Engineering Psychology, Marketing and Consumer Research, to mention a few.

Each of these fields of industrial psychology has been shaped by scientists applying their own discipline--and some borrowed disciplines--to problems of industry, commerce, and public service. Each of these fields represents a substantive contribution human factors scientists have made to the association of men and equipment in the world of work.

The Psychologist In Industry attempts to sift from a mixture of facts and opinions the information the prospective user of psychological services needs in deciding whether to seek such services and how best to profit from such services. The pamphlet constitutes a realistic statement of what the industrial psychologist can do and to some extent what he cannot do in each area of concentration.

Details covering financing, distributing and possible date of release of the publication will be available at a later date.

Advisory Panel Appraises Suitability of USES Testing

Clifford E. Jurgensen
Minneapolis Gas Company

In August 1965, Robert C. Goodwin, Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor, appointed an advisory panel to make a current objective appraisal of the suitability of USES tests for all segments of the population, including the disadvantaged. The Panel also was asked to help the Employment Service plan the direction in which the test development program should move in order to meet current needs. Although the Panel was expected to deal with public interest rather than to solve professional testing problems, the original 6-man panel included two APA members: Dr. Max F. Baer, national director of the B'nai B'rith youth organization, Washington, D.C. and Mr. Clifford E. Jurgensen, assistant vice president in charge of personnel of the Minneapolis Gas Company. In February 1966, a third APA member was added to the panel: Dr. Edwin R. Henry, consultant, personnel and employee relations, Oradell, New Jersey.

The modus operandi of the Panel consisted of the following:

1. Definition of the problem area and identification of corollary questions. This was usually accomplished in discussions with Employment Service personnel, with emphasis on representation from those segments of the organization to which the question under discussion was a significant operational problem.
2. Solicitation of comments from resource persons outside the Employment Service who were knowledgeable in the problem area and who could comment on possible solutions. Care was taken to secure resource persons who could be expected to represent major portions of the spectrum of thought on the question under discussion.
3. Closed discussions by the Panel in which comments and recommendations were compiled and agreed upon. These were documented in report form by an assigned Panel member.

The Panel placed considerable emphasis on testing the disadvantaged segments of the national work force such as the mentally and physically handicapped, new immigrants, oldsters, and Amerinds as well as those disadvantaged by

cultural, economic, and educational deprivation.

Although laudatory of the General Aptitude Test Battery when used with the groups and for the purposes for which it was originally intended, the Panel agreed with the Employment Service that the GATB was not standardized on nor developed for use with severely disadvantaged persons. In view of the vital need for, and importance of, tests for use with the disadvantaged, the Panel recommended intensification of USES efforts to develop an objective, short, and easily scored screening device to identify individuals who may not be capable of taking the present form of GATB. It also recommended continuation of work on a non-reading form of GATB which will be equated (insofar as possible) with the existing verbal form to permit utilization with the disadvantaged of the voluminous occupational norms of the present GATB. High priority was also recommended for a non-reading test of learning ability and for arithmetic and reading achievement tests with content material appropriate for adults.

The Panel endorsed the intent of the USES to establish new general working population norms for the GATB based on latest available census information. Similarly, it encouraged continuation of current programs with respect to the revision of the Occupational Aptitude Patterns and continued work on the development of Specific Aptitude Test Batteries.

The Panel urged use of a demonstration and practice test for preparing disadvantaged persons who are test-naïve and who lack "test readiness" and a suitable "test-set".

The Panel agreed with the policy of the USES with respect to (1) using test procedures designed to help the individual, and (2) using tests as only a part of the overall selection, placement and/or counseling process. It emphasized that these points be stressed in promoting understanding of testing by applicants and counselees.

The Panel noted that USES testing has stressed aptitudes, proficiency, information, and abilities; and that little work has been done in noncognitive areas such as motivation, emotional maturity, and adjustment. The Panel recommended an increase in activity in this latter area with particular emphasis on use of relevant biographical data.

In providing testing, counseling, and placement services to the disadvantaged, the Panel felt there was a need to know many details about the background, interest, and personality of the individual. The use of such material requires the imposition of rigid standards to insure appropriateness of the questions and the safeguarding of such privileged information. The Panel felt that present practices are in conformance with this policy.

The Panel deliberated at some length regarding USES orientation toward service to the employer versus service to individuals, particularly the disadvantaged. Although members were not in complete agreement as to where stress should be placed, the Panel agreed that government programs to help disadvantaged persons must also recognize the needs and viewpoints of industry as well as the individual, and that failure to do so could eliminate industry as a source of jobs for disadvantaged persons, and necessitate placing such persons in jobs outside of industry.

A critical shortage of counselors, both in terms of number and quality, was mentioned in Panel reports. The Panel supported efforts of the USES to correct these deficiencies, and noted that the basic tools for correction should include adequate pay scales, relevant in-service and out-service training, and definition of an appropriate professional status including the establishment of a career "ladder".

The Panel recognized that development and publication of tests by both the Employment Service and private firms was almost certain to continue, but cautioned that unnecessary duplication should be minimized by a concentration of USES in those areas in which private sources do not provide the services and materials needed by the USES in serving the public. The Panel also recommended cooperative participation of "outside" individuals and organizations in developing and improving USES test instruments. It was pointed out that such a policy would provide expansion of resources, provide for creative cross-fertilization, and tend to enhance the quality and usefulness of test instruments.

The Panel felt that the effectiveness of USES guidance and placement effort would be greatly enhanced by better understanding of its policies and practices by educators, school counselors, students and parents. The Panel felt that there is a severe lack of knowledge and understanding of

USES by such persons, and the USES should take the lead in remedying this situation through programs developed by USES and conducted by local Employment Service offices. The Panel further recommended that studies be conducted periodically among employers, educators, and the general public to ascertain attitudes concerning testing and related services provided by the USES so there would be a continuing evaluation of the USES by its "clients" and its "customers".

The final report of the committee has been submitted to Mr. Frank H. Cassell who has recently replaced Dr. Louis Levine as Director of the United States Employment Service in the Bureau of Employment Security under the U.S. Department of Labor. Recommendations in the report currently are being studied to determine further action which should be taken by the USES.

EDITORIAL NOTE

Forever the optimist, I am sure that somewhere there is an industrial psychologist who will write an addendum or rebuttal to Jack Bartlett's article, "The Industrial Psychology ABEPP: Evaluating the Evaluators," but with the deadline for this issue long since past, it appears that more stimulus should be applied if we are to get a response, and so I am reprinting comments concerning state certification or licensing examinations from some state newsletters.

The June issue of the Oregon Psychological Association Newsletter contained a letter to the Editor by Buell E. Goocher on the questionable validity of the State Examination and a reply from H. M. Manning. The October issue had further replies and suggestions concerning the examination from Donlon G. McGovern and Arthur N. Wiens. Dr. Wiens was Chairman of the State Board of Psychologist Examiners when the first Oregon examination was given.

Mr. McGovern wrote, "Undeniably there is need to protect the public from the inadequate and/or unscrupulous practitioner. And yet, in order to accomplish this, an examination is utilized which sounds as if it would be short-lived were it employed within any graduate department in the country. What good is an examination if 50% or better of those taking it can pass it? After all, is not failure the acceptable measure of success in the training of psychologists? It would seem quite simple to circumvent the alternatives such as Dr. Goocher's "Why didn't someone. . .?" or Dr. Manning's proposal to empirically validate the test items. I would like to propose a far more parsimonious solution by adhering to the tradition deeply rooted in graduate training and utilize any means which would:

1. overlook the prolonged observations of professors, supervisors, employers and peers;
2. sample as small a segment of behavior under as stressful and artificial conditions as can be devised within the limits of contemporary academic procedure;
3. enhance an attrition of 50% or better.

"Perhaps WE should take the basic science examination too, then we would not need to make up a new exam to meet the above criteria. In all too many instances perhaps, one's degree is the fool's reward for having played the fool long before ever approaching a board of examiners for certification.

"Since we have been advised by our new president that criticism without alternatives falls on unhearing ears, I feel compelled to add the following in order that what has gone before might be considered. Apparently the board of examiners will continue to overlook the obvious insult to the institutions that turn us out by minimizing credentials. If an examination is necessary then Dr. Goocher's and Dr. Manning's proposals are both vital. Why not a certification procedure which would serve to define the professional psychologist not only as a program of information but also as a human comprised of attitudes, beliefs, convictions and actions.

After quoting the Oregon Statute that describes the certification of psychologists, Dr. Wiens wrote:

"The state of Oregon is not alone in requiring an examination to be part of the certification (or licensure) procedures. All 28 states with legal certification require examination: in 22 states the examination is mandatory, and in 6 states the Examining Board has the discretionary power to waive the examination. In only 1 of the aforementioned 22 states is the examination unassembled, i.e., consisting of credentials submitted by the applicant.

"Problems regarding construction and utilization of such examinations have been a source of headache for all State Boards. Many of these concerns have been voiced at the meeting of the American Association of State Psychology Boards (AASPB). In fact, one of the forces leading to the establishment of AASPB was the wish among member boards to undertake a cooperative venture in the construction of a single examination which could be used by any Member Board which wished to do so. Hope was expressed that such an examination would spare Psychology the divisive and disruptive experiences other professions have suffered because of the lack of a common examination program; that it would serve the interests of state boards by providing them with a written examination of good quality; and that it would serve the profession by establishing a procedure that would maintain standards and facilitate the mobility of psychologists.

"Some basic decisions were (1) to involve as many qualified psychologists as possible in the writing of questions; (2) to involve the state boards themselves in the question development process; (3) to develop a basic examination

geared to the level of a person with a doctorate and 1-2 years of experience; (4) to prepare an examination that would not favor any particular field of application but that would assess the candidate's judgment in the use of psychological principles and procedures and his ability to integrate and apply this knowledge; and (5) to delegate the administration of the examinations directly to the state board themselves.

"Writers of items were solicited from all state associations, all certification boards, and numerous other segments of American and Canadian Psychology, thus insuring the widest possible base of participation. Submitted items were sent to specific Item Review Panels made up of psychologists representing a number of specialized professional areas in psychology. The list of psychologists who were asked to (and did) serve on these final Review Panels included many eminent and respected American and Canadian psychologists. To the best of their ability they selected items that would be fair, as far as humanly possible, to all segments of professional scientific psychology.

"Items in the test have been assigned to five applied areas: school, clinical, social, industrial and experimental. Subscores in each of these areas are reported to Boards. The subject matter of the questions, thought to constitute a common core of knowledge in psychology, includes: statistics, research design and interpretation, professional affairs and ethics, history, systems and philosophy.

This is the test used in Oregon.

"On the problem of validation, it was concluded that the best guarantee of validity is the involvement of many competent psychologists, from all applied professional areas, in the development of the test. It is foreseen that such involvement, along with analyses based on test use, will lead to continuing refinement of the objectives of the test and sharpened definition of its function. Indeed, a second version is already being prepared and may involve more extensive sampling of concepts in learning theory, motivation and personality theory, construction and interpretation of tests, social processes, and physiological factors underlying a wide range of behavior phenomena.

"I believe the test currently being used is the best test available to certification boards. It is not a perfect or a final test and, as noted above, will be revised continuously. Hope-

fully, many aspects of its future revisions can be based on the reactions and helpful comments of its consumers, the candidates for certification. The Board of Psychologist Examiners has welcomed such comments in the past and will, I am sure, always welcome them in the future."

Noble H. Kelley, Chairman of ABEPP has written to say that a member of Division 14 has been asked to prepare an article for TIP about the Industrial ABEPP. I hope that the article will stimulate more to apply for the ABEPP diploma. As pointed out in a note in the November 1965 TIP, only a small proportion of members of the Division who are probably qualified seem to be seeking ABEPP status which is a self-solicited certification of the achievement of a high level of competence in practice, as opposed to Fellowship which is an unsolicited honor conferred on the basis of original contributions that have had significant impact on the thinking and practice of others in the field.

J.B.

APA Division 14
Executive Committee & Committee Chairmen
1966-67

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President Marvin Dunnette	President-Elect Philip Ash
Past-President Ross Stagner	Secretary-Treasurer Herbert H. Meyer
Representatives of APA Council William A. Owens, Jr. (1964-67) Stanley E. Seashore (1964-67) Bernard Bass (1965-67) Herbert H. Meyer (1966-69)	Members at Large Walter R. Mahler (1964-67) Robert Perloff (1965-68) Clifford E. Jurgenson (1966-69)

Newsletter Editor
John R. Boulger

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Education and Training James C. Naylor, Chn. C. J. Bartlett George W. England Edward E. Lawler A. C. MacKinney Howard Maher Ernest J. McCormick	Scientific Affairs Patricia C. Smith, Chn. Robert Glaser Frederick I. Herzberg Wayne E. Kirchner Luigi Petruccio Harry C. Triandis Karl E. Weick Joseph Weitz	Special Interests James J. Kennan, Chn. Committee members names not available yet.
Program Robert Gulon, Chn. Lyman W. Porter, Chn. 1967-68 Lewis Albright James J. Keenan Felix Lopez Melvin R. Marks John B. Miner Lyman W. Porter	Fellowship Douglas Bray, Chn. B. von Haller Gilmer Clifford E. Jurgenson Edward A. Rundquist	Public Relations J. E. Uhlman, Chn. John Butler Arthur J. Drucker Mortimer Feinberg Herbert S. Kamin, Jr. Abraham Korman Neil Miller Frank Uhlmann
Membership Victor H. Vroom, Chn. Brent Baxter Albert S. Glickman Robert Gulon Seymour Levy Donald Taylor Albert S. Thompson	Workshop Erich P. Prien, Chn. Ralph R. Canter Raymond D. Hedberg Jack A. Parrish Richard K. Rosensteel Jay T. Rusmore E. C. Webster John V. Zuckerman	Professional Affairs Joseph H. McPerson, Chn. William D. Buel W. Ralph G. Bender Theodore R. Lindbom
Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Student Fellowships Henry R. Brenner, Co-Chn. Ralph R. Canter James R. Glennon L. Richard Hoffman Raymond A. Katzell A. C. MacKinney P. W. Maloney		Edwin R. Henry, Co-Chn. William McGehee Herbert H. Meyer William A. Owens, Jr. Jack A. Parrish Ross Stagner Joseph Weitz